

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No. : **10/727,931** Confirmation No. **6977**  
Applicant : **Elizabeth M. COMSTOCK, William L. KRUGER, Brian A. HOWELL,  
Stephen C. BOTZKO, Robert V. SEILER, Jeffrey G. BERNSTEIN,  
Gary J. SULLIVAN**  
Filed : **December 4, 2003**  
TC/A.U. : **2154**  
Examiner : **Viet Duy VU (571/272-3977)**  
Docket No. : **199-0174US-D**  
Customer No. : **29855**  
Title : **MEDIA ROLE MANAGEMENT IN A VIDEO CONFERENCING NETWORK**

Box Appeal Brief  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Mail Stop: Appeal Briefs – Patents

**AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF**

This amended appeal brief is filed in response to the Notification of Non-Complaint Appeal Brief mailed November 27, 2007. As set forth therein, the introductory portions of the originally filed Appeal Brief inadvertently omitted the status of claim 14, although the body of the brief did address claim 14. This Appeal Brief has been amended to refer to claim 14 at all pertinent locations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	3
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	3
V.	SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER .....	3
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL .....	7
VII.	ARGUMENT .....	7
A.	The Rejection of Claim 1 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	7
1.	Smith Does Not Disclose a Plurality of Output Switches.....	9
2.	Smith Does Not Disclose a Policy Manager.....	9
B.	The Rejection of Claim 2 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	13
C.	The Rejection of Claim 3 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	13
D.	The Rejection of Claim 4 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	14
E.	The Rejection of Claim 7 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	14
F.	The Rejection of Claim 9 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	15
G.	The Rejection of Claim 10 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	15
H.	The Rejection of Claim 12 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	16
I.	The Rejection of Claim 13 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	16
J.	Claim 14 Has Been Indicated to Be Allowable Over Smith.....	16
K.	The Rejection of Claim 16 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	17
L.	The Rejection of Claim 18 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	17
M.	The Rejection of Claim 19 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper.....	17
N.	Conclusion .....	18
VIII.	CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	19
IX.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	23
X.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX.....	23

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is Polycom, Inc.

**II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

None

**III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1–13 and 15–19 are rejected. Claim 14 is objected to. The appealed claims are 1–19.

**IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

None filed

**V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

This section provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by paragraph and line number and to the drawings by reference characters as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Where applicable, each element of the claims is identified with a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings. Line numbers refer to the published application. Citation to the specification and/or drawings does not imply that limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element. Additionally, references are not necessarily exhaustive, and various claim elements may also be described at other locations.

Independent claim 1 recites a multimedia conferencing terminal. The multimedia conferencing terminal includes:

- A media display (§ 33; Fig. 2, elements 152, 154);
- A plurality of output switches, each output switch receiving one or more media outputs, each output switch responsive to an output control signal for selecting one or more of the one or more media outputs to output as switched outputs, thereby providing one or more switched outputs to the media display (§ 30, ll. 6–9; Fig. 2, elements 152, 154); and

- A policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to generate the output control signal wherein the predetermined policy depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media outputs and indicative of a role of the one or more media outputs, and the policy manager providing the output control signal to the plurality of output switches, whereby the media display is controlled according to the predetermined policy (§ 30, ll. 16–18; § 36; § 39, ll. 15–16, § 44, l. 2–§ 46, l. 21; Fig. 2, element 136).

Dependent claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- A plurality of media displays, each of the plurality of media displays being controlled according to the predetermined policy (§ 33, ll. 1–9; § 36; Fig. 2, elements 152, 154); and

Dependent claim 3 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- A plurality of media sources (§s 32, 35; Fig. 2, elements 140, 142, 144, 146, 148, 150)
- A plurality of source switches, each source switch receiving one or more of the plurality of media sources, each source switch responsive to a source control signal for selecting the one or more of the plurality of media sources to output as switched sources, thereby providing one or more switched sources (§ 30, ll. 1–6; § 32, ll. 1–3; § 35; Fig. 2, elements 102, 106); and
- The policy manager applying the predetermined policy to generate the source control signal, and the policy manager providing the source control signal to the plurality of source switches, whereby the one or more switched sources are controlled according to the predetermined policy (§ 35; Fig. 2, element 136).

Dependent claim 4 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- Wherein the predetermined policy includes a content policy and a people policy (§ 35, ll. 3–5; § 35, ll. 13–15; § 36, ll. 4–6; § 36, ll. 14–16; § 46).

Independent claim 7 recites a multimedia conferencing system. The multimedia conferencing system includes:

- A multipoint conference unit (§ 26, ll. 11–17; Fig. 1, elements 20, 20a, 20b); and
- A plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals connected in a communicating relationship with the multipoint conference unit, each multimedia conferencing terminal including a policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to a plurality of media streams associated with a multimedia conference among the plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals wherein the predetermined policy depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the plurality of media streams and indicative of a role of one or more of the plurality of media streams (§§ 23, 25; § 44, l. 2–§ 46, l. 21; Fig. 1, elements 70, 90).

Independent claim 9 recites a multimedia conferencing device. The multimedia conferencing device includes:

- A network interface for coupling with at least one multimedia conferencing device in a conference (§ 23, ll. 1–5; § 25, ll. 1–4; Fig. 2, element at far right connecting to Network Comm Stack 132);
- A switch coupled to the network interface, wherein the switch receiving one or more media streams from one or more sources, each switch responsive to a control signal for selecting one or more of media streams to output as switched outputs (§ 30, ll. 6–9; § 36; Fig. 2, elements 110, 114); and
- A policy manager coupled to the switch, wherein the policy manager generates the control signal for the switch according to a predetermined policy that depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media streams and indicating a role of the one or more media streams (§ 36; § 39 ll. 14–16; § 44, l. 2–§ 46, l.21; Fig. 2, element 136).

Dependent claim 10 depends from claim 9 and further recites:

- Wherein the policy includes assigning hierarchical roles to streams, wherein the hierarchy of roles are indicated by labels in the media streams (Abstract; ¶ 8, ll. 6–9; ¶ 48; ¶ 63).

Dependent claim 12 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- Wherein the people stream is displayed on a people display; and wherein the content stream is displayed on a content display (¶ 33; Fig. 2, elements 110, 114, 152, 154).

Dependent claim 13 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- A capability manager coupled to the policy manager, wherein the capability manager negotiate the communication capability with the coupled multimedia conference device (¶ 37; Fig. 2, element 128).

Dependent claim 16 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- A converter coupled to the network interface, wherein the converter is configured to detect a first role signal of a received media stream, convert the first role signal into a second role signal for the media stream, and retransmit the media stream (¶ 39, ll. 9–14; Fig. 2, element 134).

Dependent claim 18 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- Wherein a video stream of a first role is displayed on a first section of the first video display (¶ 33, ll. 9–13); and
- Wherein a video stream of a second role is displayed on a second section of the first video display (¶ 33, ll. 9–13).

Dependent claim 19 depends from claim 1 and further recites:

- Wherein a video stream of a first role is displayed on the first video display (¶ 33, Fig. 2, elements 110, 152); and

- Wherein a video stream of a second role is displayed on the second video display (¶ 33, ll.; Fig. 2, elements 114, 154).

## **VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

Claims 1–13 and 15–19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,218,649 to Smith et al. (“Smith”).

## **VII. ARGUMENT**

The claims do not stand or fall together. Instead, Appellants present separate arguments for various independent and dependent claims. After a concise discussion of cited art, each of these arguments is separately argued below and presented with separate headings and sub-heading as required by 37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1)(vii). To aid in review of the Office Action, certain rejections have been copied into this brief. Arguments as to the rejection then follow.

### **A. The Rejection of Claim 1 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Independent claim 1 was rejected as obvious over Smith. Specifically, claim 1 was rejected as follows:

Per claims 1-2 and 5, Smith discloses a multimedia conferencing comprising:

- a) a plurality of media displays (3, fig. 1) at end users,
- b) a multipoint controller unit (MCU 1, fig. 1) having a plurality of output switches, each output switch receiving one or more media outputs from one or more sources, each output switch responsive to an output control signal for selecting one or more of the one or more media outputs to output as switched outputs, thereby providing one or more switched outputs to the media display (see col 6, lines 46-65);

c) a policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to generate the output control signal, and the policy manager providing the output control signal to the MCU, whereby the media display is controlled according to the predetermined policy (see col 7, lines 16-30).

Smith also teaches using/maintaining an ID/label in a conference database to identify a media type of each participant, i.e., audio, video, (see col 17, lines 1-41). Smith does not explicitly teach using a signal selection policy that depends upon signal ID/labels. Smith however teaches applying certain signal selection policy that would depend upon at least user signal types (i.e., audio, video) and statuses (i.e., active, inactive) (see col 19, lines 3-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize such use of signal ID/label in a signal selection policy making because it would have enabled the system to properly select a particular multimedia signal.

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at pp. 3-4. This rejection is improper for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to a multimedia conferencing terminal and includes three elements. In short, these elements are: (1) a media display, (2) a plurality of output switches, and (3) a policy manager. Further limitations on both the plurality of output switches and the policy manager are recited in the claim and are discussed in greater detail below. To render obvious claim 1, Smith must teach or suggest a multimedia conferencing terminal that includes each of the three elements described above.



## **1. Smith Does Not Disclose a Plurality of Output Switches**

The plurality of output switches limitation in its entirety recites:

a plurality of output switches, each output switch receiving one or more media outputs, each output switch responsive to an output control signal for selecting one or more of the one or more media outputs to output as switched outputs, thereby providing one or more switched outputs to the media display.

The Examiner contends that Smith discloses the required plurality of output switches as part of MCU 1 in Fig. 1 and at col. 6, ll. 46–65. This contention is incorrect for at least two reasons. First, Examiner has already contended that the media display limitation is met by user terminal 3 in Fig. 1. Therefore, it must be this user terminal that is the claimed multimedia conferencing terminal. However, for the plurality of output switches limitation, Examiner turns to MCU 1, also in Fig. 1. MCU 1 is not part of the user terminal. Therefore, even if MCU 1 contained the required plurality of output switches, it cannot meet the plurality of output switches limitation.

Second, neither Fig. 1 nor col. 6, ll. 46–65 identifies a plurality of output switches. Moreover, the description at col. 6, ll. 46–65 does not relate to either the user terminal or the MCU. The cited passage relates to a dynamic selection controller 13, which requests media streams to be passed to the user's terminal 10 from the network 12. Although the passage states that the dynamic selection controller 13 can be part of the user terminal or the network, nowhere are a plurality of output switches identified. Furthermore, to the extent a plurality of output switches exists at all, it clearly is not part of the user terminal (as recited in claim 1) because the selection signal passes out to the network.

Moreover, despite the clear differences between the language of the plurality of output switches limitation of claim 1 and what is disclosed and suggested by Smith, Examiner has made no showing as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Smith to meet the plurality of output switches limitation of claim 1. Therefore, the cited passages of Smith do not and cannot be held to teach or suggest the plurality of output switches limitation of claim 1.

## **2. Smith Does Not Disclose a Policy Manager**

The policy manager limitation in its entirety recites:

a policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to generate the output control signal wherein the predetermined policy depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media outputs and indicative of a role of the one or more media outputs, and the policy manager

providing the output control signal to the plurality of output switches, whereby the media display is controlled according to the predetermined policy.

The Examiner contends that Smith discloses the required policy manager at col. 7, ll. 16–30. However, this contention is incorrect for at least the following reasons.

As recited in the policy manager limitation, the policy manager must apply a predetermined policy that “depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media outputs.” The one or more labels must be “indicative of a role of the one or more media outputs.” Smith fails to meet either of these limitations. In the cited passage, Smith teaches that: “The policy make [sic: may] take into account, media steam activity periods, and the changing conference environment, and may express how to respond to detected resource limitations.” Smith at col. 7, ll. 23–26. Thus, Smith teaches that the policy can be based on media stream activity periods or “the changing conference environment.” Media stream activity periods are clearly not labels associated with the one or more media outputs. Moreover, media stream activity periods are not indicative of a role of the one or more media outputs. While it is not clear what “the changing conference environment” means, in context it does not appear that it in any relates to a label associated with a media stream that indicates a role of the media stream.

Examiner attempts to bolster the rejection by noting that Smith teaches an ID/label to identify a media type of each participant at col. 17, ll. 1–41. The only relevant portion of this passage appears to be col. 17, ll. 40–46, which teaches:

A Media-tuple is required for each media stream being offered by the owner. It consists of a pre-assigned “type” identifier (such as CD-AUDIO), an “ID” to uniquely identify this media within a machine, a “Name” to be used within the graphical user interface, and a media stream Multicast IP and Port address on which to receive this stream.

Assuming for the sake of argument that this passage does describe a “label associated with the one or more media outputs,” it still does not teach that the label describes a role of the media stream. Moreover, even if this passage taught a label that described a role of the media stream, there is still no teaching or suggestion that Smith implements any policy based on this label. As noted above, Smith’s labels appear to be based on timing and other parameters that are not part of any label at all, much less a label indicative of a role of the media stream in the conference.

In response to the arguments above, Examiner's Final Office Action stated the following:

The examiner disagrees. While Smith does not explicitly state a signal selection policy that would depend upon a signal ID or label, Smith however clearly teaches applying one or more policies that would make use of media types and sources of data streams. For instance, a policy for displaying only video of j most recent speakers would require a signal selection circuit with an ability to recognize and identify a data stream type (i.e., video, audio) and its source (i.e., coming from which speaker) (see col 19, lines 21-35). Additionally, Smith also teaches utilizing a media header for storing media ID/labels that indicate at least media types, IDs, timestamps, etc., that would be used by the media receiver for performing appropriate signal selection and/or signal synchronization (see col 17, lines 40-46 and col 21, lines 3-11). Thus, taken as a whole, the examiner submits that Smith would have fairly suggested a policy that would have utilized media IDs/labels/attributes for making signal selection as required by the present claims.

Final Office Action of December 20, 2006 at p. 3.

Examiner's conclusory statement notwithstanding, Smith does not teach applying policies that depend on a label associated with a stream that indicates a role of the stream. Examiner provides additional citation to col. 19, ll. 21-35 in support of this proposition. This passage describes various policies that may be applied in a video conference. The passage plainly states that "Many policies may be defined *based on the nature of the conference* such as a lecture, group meeting, or hosted tour." Smith at col. 19, ll. 10-12 (emphasis added). The nature of a conference is not a label associated with a media stream that specifies a role of the video stream.

The passage goes on to describe policies based on active speakers and the length of time they have been speaking, etc. Examiner suggests that this information can be derived from some sort of header, but concedes that “Smith does not explicitly state a signal selection policy that would depend upon a signal ID or label.” Furthermore, even if Smith did disclose a signal selection policy depending on a signal ID or label, there is still no label that indicates a role of the stream.

Examiner also cites col. 21, ll. 3–11 to support his position. However, this passage merely states that “media headers usually incorporate absolute or relative timestamps, sequence numbers and media encoding identifiers. These headers serve to identify the nature of the media within the stream, enable synchronization at the receiver and provide a common stream structure that may be recognized at the receiver(s).” Nothing in this passage describes policies based on these headers nor does anything in this passage describe anything in the headers relating to the role of a stream. The nature of the media, *i.e.*, the type of data, is not the same thing as the role of the stream. Even if it were, there is still no teaching or suggestion in Smith that policies are implemented based on this header. As noted above, the Examiner has conceded that “Smith does not explicitly state a signal selection policy that would depend upon a signal ID or label.” Additionally, Examiner has not provided any citation to a label that indicates a role of a media stream.

Moreover, Examiner has made no showing as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would modify Smith to meet the policy manager limitation of claim 1. Examiner has merely concluded that “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize such use of signal ID/label in a signal selection policy making because it would have enabled the system to properly select a particular multimedia signal.” This conclusion is not supported by the reference or any other evidence of record. At best, Smith teaches some sort of selection policies and some sort of stream labels. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the policies are based on the labels. In fact, Smith clearly teaches, and Examiner concedes, that the policies are based on something other than the labels. The teaching of selections based on something other than labels coupled with labels that are used for things other than selections does not suggest selections based on labels. Moreover, Smith’s labels have no indication of the role of the stream in the conference. Therefore, the cited

passages of Smith do not and cannot be held to teach or suggest the policy manager limitation of claim 1.

Reversal of the rejection of claim 1, as well as all claims depending therefrom, is therefore requested.

**B. The Rejection of Claim 2 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and was also rejected as obvious over Smith as set forth above. However, Smith does not disclose a multimedia conferencing device comprising a plurality of media displays as recited. Examiner's citation to the plurality of user stations 3 in Fig. 1 is not on point. Although there is presumably a display inherent in each of the user stations, there is no teaching or suggestion that any station includes a plurality of stations as required by claim 2. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**C. The Rejection of Claim 3 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and was also rejected as obvious over Smith as set forth below.

Per claim 3, Smith teaches mixing or selecting one or more media sources for delivering to the users (see col 8, lines 11-21) .

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 4.

Claim 3 specifies three further limitations on claim 1: (1) a plurality of media sources, (2) a plurality of source switches, and (3) the policy manager also controls the source switches. As made clear by both the claim language and Applicants' specification at Fig. 2 and ¶ 32, these components are separate from the output switches and media streams recited in claim 1. Examiner has made no attempt to identify any of these elements in Smith. Examiner's only citation to the reference is to col. 8, ll. 11-21 which describes audio mixing.

Mixing and switching are two entirely different operations. Mixing of a group of signals does not necessitate the presence of a plurality of switches. Moreover, the mixing described is

not based on policies relating to a label indicating a role of the audio stream, but rather appears to be merely based on “the most active of the input audio streams.” Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**D. The Rejection of Claim 4 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and was also rejected as obvious over Smith as set forth below.

Per claim 4, Smith teaches providing selecting media stream based on a content policy, e.g., audio or video, and/or people policy, e.g., chairperson control (see col 19, lines 3-67).

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 5.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and recites that the predetermined policy of claim 1 includes a content policy and a people policy. “People policy” and “content policy” are terms of art. Examples of people and content policies are given in Applicants’ specification at ¶ 46. Examiner’s rejection does not take into account the specialized meanings of people policy and content policy that would be understood by one skilled in the art. Furthermore, by its own terms Examiner’s rejection at best identifies only a content policy. The language of claim 4 plainly requires both a people policy and a content policy. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**E. The Rejection of Claim 7 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Independent claim 7 was also rejected as obvious over Smith. Specifically, claim 7 was rejected as follows:

Claims 7-8, 11-13, 15 and 17-19 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-6 and 9-10.

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 5. Claim 7 recites a conferencing system comprising an MCU and a plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals that include a policy manager substantially as outlined above. Because Smith does not teach or suggest a policy manager for

the at least the reasons set forth above, this rejection is improper and reversal of this rejection is requested.

**F. The Rejection of Claim 9 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Independent claim 9 was also rejected as obvious over Smith. Specifically, claim 7 was rejected as follows:

Per claim 9, Smith teaches a network interface for coupling with conferencing device (see col 7, lines 35-48).

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 5. Claim 9 recites a multimedia conferencing device comprising a network interface, a switch similar to the plurality of switches recited in claim 1, and a policy manager similar to the policy manager recited in claims 1 and 7. Smith does not teach or suggest the recited switch for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the plurality of switches in claim 1. Moreover, Smith does not teach or suggest the recited policy manager for the at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 7. Therefore, this rejection is improper and reversal of this rejection is requested.

**G. The Rejection of Claim 10 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and was also rejected as obvious over Smith as set forth below.

Per claim 10, Smith further teaches assigning priority to data stream for displaying signals in select order (see col 19, lines 46-53). It is noted that priority would be hierarchically defined.

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 5.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and recites that “the policy [implemented by the policy manager] includes assigning hierarchical roles to streams, wherein the hierarchy of roles are indicated by labels in the media streams.” Examiner cites col. 19, ll. 46–53 as teaching the required hierarchy. However, this suggests a lack of understanding of the meaning of hierarchy as used in the present application.

The nature of the hierarchy of roles is summarized in ¶ 8 of Applicants' specification and is further described in ¶ 48. Nothing in the passage cited by Examiner relates in any way to this or any other hierarchy of roles. As was noted above, nothing in Smith relates in any way at all to the identification or description of the roles of streams in a conference, whether hierarchical or not. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**H. The Rejection of Claim 12 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 12 depends from claim 11, which depends from claim 9. Claim 12 recites that the outputs include a people stream and a content stream and that these streams be displayed on a people display and a content display. Nowhere has Examiner made any attempt to identify these limitations in Smith, nor has the undersigned found these limitations in Smith. Moreover, Examiner has not provided any reason that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Smith to provide these missing limitations. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**I. The Rejection of Claim 13 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 13 depends from claim 9. Claim 13 recites that the policy manager is coupled to a capability manager that negotiates communication capabilities. Nowhere has Examiner made any attempt to identify these limitations in Smith, nor has the undersigned found these limitations in Smith. Moreover, Examiner has not provided any reason that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Smith to provide these missing limitations. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**J. Claim 14 Has Been Indicated to Be Allowable Over Smith**

Claim 14 has been objected to as allowable but dependent on a rejected base claim. Because the base claims are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth above, this objection is improper.



**K. The Rejection of Claim 16 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 16 depends from claim 9 and was also rejected as obvious over Smith as set forth below.

Per claim 16, Smith teaches processing and converting media stream signal from one form to another (see Smith in col 20, lines 11-48) .

Office Action of August 30, 2006 at p. 6.

Claim 16 recites that the multimedia conferencing device include a converter “configure to detect a first role signal of a received media stream, [and] convert the first role signal into a second role signal.” As was discussed above, Smith contains no teaching or suggestion as to the role of various signals. Therefore, Smith cannot teach a converter for converting a first role signal into a second role signal. The only “conversion” described in the cited passages of Smith relates to conversion of resolution or color information. Neither resolution nor color in any relates to the role of the stream in a conference. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**L. The Rejection of Claim 18 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 18 depends from claim 17, which depends from claim 9. Claim 18 recites that a video stream of a first role is displayed on a first section of a first video display and a video stream of a second role is displayed on a second section of the first display. Nowhere has Examiner made any attempt to identify these limitations in Smith, nor has the undersigned found these limitations in Smith. Moreover, Examiner has not provided any reason that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Smith to provide these missing limitations. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**M. The Rejection of Claim 19 as Obvious Over Smith Is Improper**

Claim 19 depends from claim 17, which depends from claim 9. Claim 19 recites that a video stream of a first role is displayed on a first video display and a video stream of a second role is displayed on a second video display. Nowhere has Examiner made any attempt to

identify these limitations in Smith, nor has the undersigned found these limitations in Smith. Moreover, Examiner has not provided any reason that one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify Smith to provide these missing limitations. Therefore, this rejection is improper, and reversal of the rejection is requested.

**N. Conclusion**

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding rejections should be reversed. Additionally, to the extent specific claims have not been addressed, these claims depend from one or more claims that are specifically addressed, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims specifically addressed. Applicants further believe that they have complied with each requirement for an appeal brief.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Deposit Account Number 501922, referencing docket number 199-0174USD.

\* \* \* \* \*

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Billy C. Allen III/

December 27, 2007

Filed Electronically

Billy C. Allen III, Reg. No. 46,147  
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.  
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832-446-2409

**VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (previously presented) A multimedia conferencing terminal comprising:
  - a media display;
  - a plurality of output switches, each output switch receiving one or more media outputs, each output switch responsive to an output control signal for selecting one or more of the one or more media outputs to output as switched outputs, thereby providing one or more switched outputs to the media display; and
  - a policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to generate the output control signal wherein the predetermined policy depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media outputs and indicative of a role of the one or more media outputs, and the policy manager providing the output control signal to the plurality of output switches, whereby the media display is controlled according to the predetermined policy.
2. (original) The multimedia conferencing terminal of Claim 1 further comprising a plurality of media displays, each of the plurality of media displays being controlled according to the predetermined policy.
3. (original) The multimedia conferencing terminal of Claim 1 further comprising:
  - a plurality of media sources;
  - a plurality of source switches, each source switch receiving one or more of the plurality of media sources, each source switch responsive to a source control signal for selecting the one or more of the plurality of media sources to output as switched sources, thereby providing one or more switched sources; and
  - the policy manager applying the predetermined policy to generate the source control signal, and the policy manager providing the source control signal to the plurality of source switches, whereby the one or more switched sources are controlled according to the predetermined policy.
4. (original) The multimedia conferencing terminal of Claim 1 wherein the predetermined policy includes a content policy and a people policy.

5. (original) The multimedia conferencing terminal of Claim 1 wherein the media sources include at least one of a microphone, a camera, and a computer.
6. (original) The multimedia conferencing terminal of Claim 1 further comprising a token manager, the token manager operating a periodically reserve for the terminal an exclusive control over one or more roles of the predetermined policy.
7. (previously presented) A multimedia conferencing system comprising:
  - a multipoint conference unit; and
  - a plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals connected in a communicating relationship with the multipoint conference unit, each multimedia conferencing terminal including a policy manager, the policy manager applying a predetermined policy to a plurality of media streams associated with a multimedia conference among the plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals wherein the predetermined policy depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the plurality of media streams and indicative of a role of one or more of the plurality of media streams.
8. (original) The multimedia conferencing system of Claim 7, wherein each multimedia conferencing terminal further includes a token manager, the token managers of the plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals cooperating to provide exclusive control to one of the plurality of multimedia conferencing terminals over at least one of the plurality of media streams.

9. (previously presented) A multimedia conferencing device comprising:
  - a network interface for coupling with at least one multimedia conferencing device in a conference;
  - a switch coupled to the network interface, wherein the switch receiving one or more media streams from one or more sources, each switch responsive to a control signal for selecting one or more of media streams to output as switched outputs; and
  - a policy manager coupled to the switch, wherein the policy manager generates the control signal for the switch according to a predetermined policy that depends at least in part on one or more labels associated with the one or more media streams and indicating a role of the one or more media streams.
10. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 9,
  - wherein the policy includes assigning hierarchical roles to streams, wherein the hierarchy of roles are indicated by labels in the media streams.
11. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 9,
  - wherein the switched outputs include at least people stream and content stream.
12. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 11,
  - wherein the people stream is displayed on a people display; and wherein the content stream is displayed on a content display.
13. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 9, further comprising:
  - a capability manager coupled to the policy manager, wherein the capability manager negotiate the communication capability with the coupled multimedia conference device.
14. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 13,
  - wherein the capability manager negotiates the supported levels of hierarchy of roles and collapses the unsupported levels of roles to the lowest supported level.

15. (previously presented) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 13, further comprising:
  - a token manager coupled to the capability manager, wherein each token represents the source of a role, wherein the token manager maintain the identity of the exclusive holder of the token within the conference.
16. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 9, further comprising:
  - a converter coupled to the network interface, wherein the converter is configured to detect a first role signal of a received media stream,
  - convert the first role signal into a second role signal for the media stream, and
  - retransmit the media stream.
17. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 9, further comprising:
  - a microphone, a camera, a speaker and a first video display, all of which are coupled to the switch.
18. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 17,
  - wherein a video stream of a first role is displayed on a first section of the first video display; and
  - wherein a video stream of a second role is displayed on a second section of the first video display.
19. (original) The multimedia conferencing device in Claim 17, further comprising:
  - a second video display;
  - wherein a video stream of a first role is displayed on the first video display; and
  - wherein a video stream of a second role is displayed on the second video display.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.